



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/626,347	07/26/2000	Albert Henricus Franciscus de Heer	002566-016300	8436
64313 7590 09/24/2009 NIXON PEABODY LLP 401 Ninth Street, N.W. Suite 900 WASHINGTON, DC 20004				
EXAMINER				
DARNO, PATRICK A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2158				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/24/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/626,347  
Filing Date: July 26, 2000  
Appellant[s]: DE HEER ET AL.

\_\_\_\_\_  
James W. Drapinski  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 05/19/2009, amended 06/24/2009, and appealing from the Office action mailed 02/05/2009.

(1) **Real Party of Interest**

A statement identifying the real party interest is contained in the brief.

(2) **Related Appeals and Interferences**

The Examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings, which directly affect or be affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) **Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) **Status of Amendments After Final**

There are no unentered amendments.

(5) **Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) **Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) **Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) **Evidence Relied Upon**

US 5,740,425	Povilus	<b><u>Published:</u></b> 04-14-1998	<b><u>Priority:</u></b> 09-26-1995
US 6,182,275	Beelitz et al.	<b><u>Published:</u></b> 01-30-2001	<b><u>Priority:</u></b> 01-26-1998

US 2003/0097211      Carroll et al. **Published:** 05-22-2003      **Priority:** 10-31-1997

US 2003/0130905      Foster et al. **Published:** 07-10-2003      **Priority:** 05-22-1998

(9) **Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103[a] which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

[a] A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 11-14, 18-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103[a] as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,740,425 issued to David Povilus [hereinafter "Povilus"] and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0130905 issued to William G. Foster et al. [hereinafter "Foster"].

**Claim 1:**

Povilus discloses a data structure of a database for use in capturing product data by inputting and storing the product data in the database [Povilus: column 26, lines 38-39], the data structure of the database being based on a data model having one or more classes [Povilus: see abstract – "The concept structure includes at least one concept frame for defining classes of product groupings..."], wherein each of the classes has one or more associated categories [Povilus: see abstract, lines 9-14; Note that the classes define [or are associated with] product groupings [or categories].], the data structure being embodied in a computer readable medium [Povilus: column 5, lines 55-57 and Fig. 1] and comprising:

at least one class definition, each class definition being arranged to identify one or more associated categories of products [*Povilus: see abstract – “The concept structure includes at least one concept frame for defining classes of product groupings...”*];

a plurality of category definitions, each category definition being arranged to identify an associated attribute group of a product category [*Povilus: column 54, lines 46-66*];

a plurality of attribute group definitions, each attribute group definition being arranged to identify one or more attributes that are associated with the attribute group of a product category [*Povilus: column 14, lines 57-67*]; and

a plurality of possible value lists [*Povilus: column 10, lines 27-42*].

Povilus does not explicitly disclose:

a plurality of possible value lists for facilitating input and storage of product data into the database, each possible value list having a plurality of predetermined, user selectable values that are selectable during input and storage of product data as a value for an attribute of a product that is being classified and stored in the database so as to minimize potential error during inputting and storing of product data in accordance with the data model;

wherein each attribute is associated with at least one of the plurality of possible value lists which has a plurality of predetermined, user selectable values that are selectable during input and storage of product data as a value for the associated attribute for the product being classified and stored in the database according to the data model.

However, Foster discloses:

a plurality of possible value lists for facilitating input and storage of product data into the database, each possible value list having a plurality of predetermined, user selectable values that

are selectable during input and storage of product data as a value for an attribute of a product that is being classified and stored in the database so as to minimize potential error during inputting and storing of product data in accordance with the data model [Foster: see paragraph [0024], [0025], [0033], [0035], lines 11-15, and [0066]];

wherein each attribute is associated with at least one of the plurality of possible value lists which has a plurality of predetermined, user selectable values that are selectable during input and storage of product data as a value for the associated attribute for the product being classified and stored in the database according to the data model [Foster: see paragraph [0024], [0025], [0033], and [0066]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Povilus with the teachings of Foster noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the teachings of Povilus per the above such that product data could be inputted through the use of a drop-down menu [Foster: paragraph [0033]], thereby making the input of data into a computer system more efficient and reliable.

**Claim 2:**

Claim 2 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Foster discloses further "a plurality of possible unit lists each possible..." [Foster: see paragraph [0024], [0025], [0033], [0035], lines 11-15, and [0066]].

**Claims 3 & 4:**

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given for rejected claims 1-2 and are similarly rejected including the following:

--**Povilus** teaches “possible value list is combined with each one...a normalized value”

[*Povilus*: col. 19, lines 15-27].

**Claim 5:**

Claim 5 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

**Povilus** teaches attributes associated with a data capture priority indicator that assigns priorities...” [*Povilus*: see col. 14, line 66—column 15, line 7, *whereas Povilus’ inheritance block with attributes incorporate an order or priority of attributes associated with the different blocks, therefore teach attributes with a priority that assigns priorities as taught by the Appellant above.*].

**Claim 8:**

Claim 8 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

**Povilus** teaches “a plurality of manufacturer SKUs...SKU system...” [*Povilus*: see col. 6, lines 47-67] “a customer mapping table that maps each system SKU to a customer...” [*Povilus*: col. 22, lines 20-67].

**Claim 9 and 11:**

Claim 9 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for rejected claims 2-3 & 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Claim 11 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for rejected claims 1 & 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

**Povilus** teaches “a category identifier associated with each one of the plurality of products...corresponding product” [*Povilus*: see col. 3, lines 8-54].

**Claim 12:**

Claim 12 is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for rejected claims 1 & 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

*Povilus* teaches “a manufacturer product description associated with each one of the...describing standard features of the associated product” [*Povilus*: see col. 51, lines 34-67].

**Claim 13:**

Claim 13 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons above for rejected claims 1 & 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

*Povilus* teaches “an image table including link to one or more images illustrating the plurality of products...” [*Povilus*: see col. 25, lines 16-50 and column 24, lines 37-41].

**Claim 14:**

Claim 14 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for rejected claims 1 & 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

*Povilus* teaches “a marketing description for selected...products” [*Povilus*: see col. 33, lines 55-67 and col. 34, lines 5-25].

**Claim 18:**

Claim 18 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

**Claim 19:**

Claim 19 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

**Claim 20:**

Claim 20 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.



**Claim 21:**

Claim 21 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

**Claim 24:**

Claim 24 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 8.

Claims 6, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103[a] as being unpatentable over Povilus in view of Foster and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0097211 issued to Anthony Carroll et al. [hereinafter “Carroll”].

**Claim 6:**

Claim 6 is rejected on the grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

The combination of Povilus and Foster appears to disclose all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination fails to explicitly disclose a possible countries table specifying one or more countries that are selectable during input and storage of product data as countries for which a product being classified and stored in the database according to the data model is adapted for sale.

However, Carroll discloses a possible countries table specifying one or more countries that are selectable during input [Carroll: paragraph [0042] and Fig. 3a – 3c] and storage of product data as countries for which a product being classified and stored in the database according to the data model is adapted for sale [Carroll: paragraph [0042]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Carroll noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned

combination per the above in order to create a data entry and update method that is relatively easy to implement [*Carroll: paragraph [0007], lines 9-10*].

**Claim 15:**

Claim 15 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1, 6, and 8.

**Claim 22:**

Claim 22 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

Claims 7, 16-17, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103[a] as being unpatentable over Povilus in view of Foster and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,182,275 issued to Alan E. Beelitz et al. [hereinafter “Beelitz”].

**Claim 7:**

Claim 7 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

The combination of Povilus and Fosters discloses all the elements of claim 1, as noted above, but the previously mentioned combination does not explicitly disclose a possible compatibility table including one or more platforms that are selectable during input and storage of product data as platforms which are compatible with a specific product being classified and stored in the database according to the data model.

However, Beelitz discloses a possible compatibility table including one or more platforms that are selectable during input and storage of product data as platforms which are compatible with a specific product being classified and stored in the database according to the data model [*Beelitz: abstract, lines 2-17 and column 18, lines 17-30*].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the previously mentioned combination with the teachings of Beelitz noted above. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to improve the previously mentioned combination per the above in order to provide a data entry system that can be utilized by users of a various skill levels [Beelitz: column 3, lines 32-43]. Since a list of compatible options is presented to a user for selection therefrom, the user does not need to be familiar with the product to choose compatible items for data entry. This provides the advantage of a high level of data integrity without having to employ workers who are highly trained in the details or workings of a particular product [Beelitz: column 3, lines 37-39].

**Claim 16, 17, and 23:**

Claims 16, 17, and 23 is rejected under the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

**(10) Response to Arguments**

**Argument #1:**

**Appellant Argues:**

Appellants respectfully submit that Foster teaches a product editor that allows the input of product information, e.g., see Paragraph [0033]; however, Foster, inter alia, does not teach or suggest "a plurality of possible value lists", the plurality of value lists "for facilitating input and storage of product data into a database", as claimed in Claim 1.

In other words, it is respectfully submitted that, according to Foster, the attributes is what is selected, and all values for that selected attribute are what is input, using the product editor. Appellants respectfully submit, therefore, that Foster does not teach a selection of possible values for the attributes during input and storage of product data, as claim in Claim 1: rather, Foster teaches, entry, for a selected attribute, of all values which a product "may be offered" in for that selected attribute.

Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that the selection by a pull down menu in Foster is of the attribute for which values are to be entered, and does not teach possible values for the attribute during input and storage of product data, where each possible value list had a plurality of predetermined user selectable values that are selectable during input and storage of product data a value for an attribute of a product being classified...", as claimed in Claim 1.

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. The combination of Povilus and Foster discloses a "plurality of possible value lists," wherein the plurality of possible value lists are "for facilitating input and storage of product data into a database system" [Foster: paragraph [0033], lines 1-8 and paragraphs [0043], [0044] and paragraph [0045], lines 1-6].

It appears that the main focus of Appellant's arguments is that the cited prior art fails to disclose selecting product data from a product list during input and storage of product data. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. There are two interpretations of the rejections given which show that Appellant's claimed inventions is simply a obvious variation of the prior art.

First, Examiner asserts that Foster does disclose selecting product data from a plurality of possible value lists during input and storage of product data [Foster: paragraph [0033], lines 1-3 and paragraph [0044] and paragraph [0045], lines 1-6]. Foster: paragraph [0033], lines 1-8 clearly discloses and describes the lists wherein the possible values are selected. Furthermore, Foster paragraph [0033], lines 8-13 shows the type of information that may be input through these drop-down menus [i.e., possible value lists]. Foster: paragraphs [0043], [0044], and [0045], lines 1-6 expand on this issue. For example, Foster: paragraph [0043] shows wherein product size is selected from the lists. Note specifically that the lists provide the user with possible values of Small, Medium, or Large [Foster: paragraphs [0043] and [0044], lines 3-4]. Finally, the user input of product data [i.e., product size] is used to filter the results that are presented to a user in a "view" or "snapshot" [Foster: paragraph [0044]]. Therefore, this input had to be stored, at least in main memory, in order to perform this sorting or filtering operation. As a result, it is clear that Foster

discloses selecting product data from a plurality of possible value lists during input and storage of product data [Foster: paragraphs [0033], [0043], [0044], and [0045]].

Alternatively, one could interpret the rejection as each reference disclosing a portion of the claim limitation. For example, it is clear that Povilus discloses inputting and storing product data [Povilus: column 16, lines 62-64 and claim 7 and claim 8]. Povilus enters SKUs and creates a table to store SKUs [Povilus: column 16, lines 62-64 and claim 7 and claim 8]. Therefore, it is clear that Povilus discloses inputting and storing product data [Povilus: column 16, lines 62-64 and claim 7 and claim 8]. Povilus simply fails to disclose wherein data is inputted by selecting a value from a list.

However, Foster discloses wherein data is inputted by selecting a value from a list [Foster: paragraph [0033], lines 1-3 and paragraph [0044] and paragraph [0045], lines 1-6]. As a result, the combination of Povilus and Foster discloses selecting product data from a plurality of possible value lists during input and storage of product data [Povilus: column 16, lines 62-64 and claim 7 and claim 8 and Foster: paragraphs [0033], [0043], [0044], and [0045]]. Proper motivation to combine the references is set forth in the preceding office action.

Examiner asserts that the rejection is proper based upon one or more of the preceding interpretations. Since it appears that each and every element of the Appellant's claimed invention is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the claims remain rejected under the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.

**Argument #2:**

**Appellant Argues:**

It is respectfully submitted that a "normalized base SKU table" in Povilus does not teach or suggest a normalized possible value-unit combination; and does not teach or suggest a normalized possible value-unit

combination where the possible value-unit combination is created by combining each one of the values in the possible list with each one of the units in an associated possible unit list for one of the attributes, as claimed in Claim 3.

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. Povilus discloses “a normalized base SKU table”, wherein “a normalized possible value-unit combination is created by combining each one of the values in a possible list with each one of the units in an associated possible unit list for one of the attributes” [Povilus: column 19, lines 15-27 and column 17, lines 41-50].

The Examiner maintains that the limitations of claim 3 are obvious over the prior art of record. As interpreted by the Examiner, Appellant’s claim 3 combines or converts data items in a data structure via the process of normalization. And, as interpreted by the Examiner, Povilus takes data items stored in a data structure and combines or converts the data times using techniques of data massaging and normalization [Povilus: column 19, lines 15-27 and column 17, lines 41-50].

The Examiner sets forth that while the data items being normalized in the Povilus reference may be referred to as different names, no detail of the Appellant’s normalization process has been adequately claimed in order to make it patentably distinct from the normalization process disclosed by Povilus. Furthermore, the “possible lists” claimed by the Appellant are extremely broad, and therefore, allowing the Examiner great latitude in his interpretation of the claims. The Examiner does not deny that Appellants have an invention, but Examiner is simply asserting that the attempted scope of the claim is too broad in light of the prior art of record.

In order to more clearly convey the rejection given, the Examiner notes that Povilus: column 17, lines 41-50 discloses the claimed "combin[ing] of values in a possible list with units in an associated possible unit list" in order to "create a possible value-unit combination." Specifically, Povilus discloses creating a "normalized orderable product" [or normalized possible value-unit combination] [Povilus: column 17, lines 42-43]. This normalization process involves linking [i.e., combining] values from one "possible list" [BaseSKUs] to another "possible list" [price, availability, etc.] [Povilus: column 17, lines 41-49]. This linkage or combination is easily interpreted as a "possible value-unit combination".

Since it appears that each and every element of the Appellant's claimed invention is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the claims remain rejected under the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.

**Argument #3:**

**Appellant Argues:**

Appellants respectfully submit that a "normalized base SKU table" in Povilus, and other teachings in Povilus and Foster do not teach or suggest "a multi-value indicator" as claimed in Claim 4...

For this additional reason, Appellants respectfully submit that Claim 4 is non-obvious based on Povilus in view of Foster. Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that, on this additional basis, the rejection of Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also in error and should be reversed.

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. The Examiner stands by his initial assertion that claim 4 is rejected under the same or similar reasons as those given in the rejection of claims 1-2. The reasoning used below is largely based upon rationale similar to that used in the rejection of claim 1.

The Examiner has granted a broad, yet reasonable interpretation of the Appellant's claim language. The claimed "multi-value indicator" simply "...indicates that one of the values in the associated possible value list are selectable..." This is interpreted as, from a list of items presented to a user, multiple items can be selected. This is because if multiple items are selected from a list, they must have been selectable.

Examiner first notes that Foster discloses drop-down lists or menus which are navigable by a user [Foster: paragraph [0033]. This menu provides functionality such that "all product information is inputted initially through the product editor 20, selected through the product menu 22" [Foster: paragraph [0033], lines 2-3]. Foster further recites that "[t]he menus may be presented in a standard windowing type environment/user interface as is known to those skilled in the art [Foster: paragraph [0033], lines 6-8]. With the above portions of Foster in mind, the Examiner asserts that it was well within the knowledge of one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the functionality of selecting multiple items from a drop down list menu at the same time.

Additionally, it is noted that Foster: paragraph [0049], lines 3-4 that each product may have "multiple descriptions". Furthermore, Foster: paragraph [0033], lines 1-2 recite that "all product information" is input through the standard pull down menus. Therefore, it is reasonable to posit that multiple values were selected from the pull down menus.

Since it appears that each and every element of the Appellant's claimed invention is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the claims remain rejected under the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.



**Argument #4:**

**Appellant Argues:**

Appellants respectfully submit that neither this section of Povilus, or elsewhere, contains any teaching or suggestion of "a data capture priority indicator" or "a data capture priority indicator that assigns priorities to at least some of the one or more attributes for capture of product data for the attributes in accordance with the assigned priorities", as claim in Claim 5.

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. Examiner maintains that Povilus discloses "a data capture priority indicator that assigns priorities to at least some of the one or more attributes of product data for the attributes in accordance with the assigned priorities" [Povilus: column 14, line 66 – column 15, line 7].

Note specifically that Povilus discloses inheritance blocks with associated attributes or characteristics [Povilus: column 14, line 66 – column 15, line 3]. These characteristics assigned to inheritance structure "enforce[] navigation behaviors" of the product data characterized in the inheritance structure [Povilus: column 14, line 66 – column 15, line 7]. The Examiner asserts that this "enforcement of navigation behavior of incoming product data" which appears to guide placement of product data in an inheritance structure is equivalent to the claimed assigning of priorities by a data capture priority indicator as claimed by the Appellant.

Since it appears that each and every element of the Appellant's claimed invention is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the claims remain rejected under the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.

**Argument #5:**

**Appellant Argues:**

Appellants respectfully submit that, although Povilus teaches creating a normalized SKU table 331 in a process undertaken independently for each manufacturer who makes products within the realm of interest (see Col. 19, lines 15-19), there is no teaching in Povilus of customer SKUs, i.e., SKUs for customers where the customer is a retailer, reseller, manufacturer, or distributor that has requested the product data, or mapping system SKUs to customer SKUs, as claimed in claim 8. Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that Povilus does not teach or suggest a customer mapping table that maps each system SKU to a customer SKU assigned to the corresponding product by a particular customer to which product data associated with the product is to be provided, as claimed in Claim 8.

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. Povilus discloses a system SKU [Povilus: column 6, lines 47-67], a customer SKU assigned to the corresponding product by a particular customer to which product data associated with the product is to be provided [Povilus: column 21, lines 61-64: Note specifically that the addition of additional characters to a base product SKU that is based upon an existing manufacturer's printed binder handles. This "exploded" SKU is the customer SKU.], and a customer mapping table that maps the system SKU to the customer SKU [Povilus: column 23, line 35 and column 23, lines 56-58 and column 22, lines 20-67].

Examiner asserts that the mapping of claim elements immediately above is sufficient to show that the prior art disclose the elements claimed. However, the following comments are given to show the Examiner's thought process in interpreting the claim limitations.

A customer SKU is reasonably interpreted as simply being non-functional descriptive material which is used for the purpose of identifying person associated with a product. As non-functional descriptive material, this customer SKU or person identifier is given very little patentable weight. The weight associated with this customer SKU arises from the fact that it is a

data string used to identify a person associated with a product and/or associated with product data [potentially a product SKU].

The preceding process is disclosed by Povilus. Note that Povilus discloses a person identifier [Povilus: column 21, lines 60-64]. This identifier comprising an SKU and additional distinguishing characters associates a person [manufacturer] to a product SKU through a normalization process [Povilus: column 21, lines 60-64 and column 22, lines 20-67]. This data may be stored in a relational database management system [RDBMS] [Povilus: column 22, lines 57-58]. In such an RDBMS environment, this data would be manipulated in tables, this require a table to carry out this normalized mapping of the person/manufacturer identifier with SKU. As a result, the Examiner asserts that there is no functional difference between Appellant's claim 8 and the cited prior art which makes the limitations patentably distinct from one another.

Furthermore, if the cited portions were not proof enough of this process, Examiner directs the Appellant to Povilus: column 17, lines 41-50. This passage of Povilus also discloses wherein an SKU is associated with, among other things, a manufacturer's unique identifier [Povilus: column 17, lines 41-50]. As a result, it appears the Povilus reference discloses the claimed mapping of a product SKU to a customer SKU/person identifier.

Since it appears that each and every element of the Appellant's claimed invention is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the claims remain rejected under the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.

**Argument #6:**

**Appellant Argues:**

Appellants respectfully submit that the country list for downloading a vehicle alignment specification, as taught in Carroll, does not teach or suggest "a possible countries table specifying one or more countries that are selectable during input and storage of product data...", as claimed in Claim 6.

It is respectfully submitted that the country list for downloading a vehicle alignment specification, as taught in Carroll, does not teach or suggest a country table specifying one or more countries for which each product [is] classified and stored in the database according to the data model is adapted for sale, as claimed in Claim 15.

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. As noted in the response to Argument #1 above, the combination of Povilus and Foster discloses wherein product data attributes are selectable during input and storage of product data [see at least Povilus: column 16, lines 62-64 and claim 7 and claim 8 and Foster: paragraphs [0033], [0043], [0044], and [0045]]. The combination of Povilus and Foster simply fail to disclose wherein a list of possible countries are presented such that the user can make a selection of the one of the listed countries.

However, as noted in the office action above, Carroll discloses wherein the data sets forth a list of possible countries such that the user can make a selection of one of the listed countries [Carroll: paragraphs [0041], [0042], and [0043]]. As a result, the combination of Povilus, Foster, and Carroll renders Appellant's claims 6 and 15 as simply an obvious variation of the prior art of record.

Since it appears that each and every element of the Appellant's claimed invention is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the claims remain rejected under the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.

**Argument #7:**

**Appellant Argues:**

Appellants respectfully submit that, although Beelitz discloses a list of operating systems (Abstract) and a list of software programs (Col. 18, lines 17-30) from which a user can make a selection, Beelitz, either singly or in any theoretical combination with the other references, does not teach or suggest a possible compatibility table including one or more platforms that are selectable during input and storage of product data as platforms which are compatible with a specific product being classified and stored in the database according to the data model, as claimed in these claims.

That is, Appellants respectfully submit that there is no teaching or suggestion in Beelitz of "platforms that are selectable during input and storage of product data", as claimed in Claim 7.

**Examiner Responds:**

Examiner is not persuaded. The Examiner asserts that the limitations of claim 7 are obvious in view of the combination of Povilus, Foster, and Beelitz. Like Examiner's response to Argument #6, it is noted that Povilus and Foster discloses wherein product data attributes are selectable during input and storage of product data [see at least Povilus: column 16, lines 62-64 and claim 7 and claim 8 and Foster: paragraphs [0033], [0043], [0044], and [0045]]. The combination of Povilus and Foster simply fail to disclose wherein a list of platforms [or operating systems] is presented such that the user can make a selection of a desired platform or operating system from a list.

However, Beelitz sets forth the limitation of providing a user with a list of platforms or operating systems such that the user can make a selection of a desired platform or operating system from a list [Beelitz: abstract and column 18, lines 17-30]. As a result, the combination of Povilus, Foster, and Beelitz appears to disclose each and every element of the Appellant's claimed invention.

Since it appears that each and every element of the Appellant's claimed invention is either disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record, the claims remain rejected under the reasons set forth in the preceding office action.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the Examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this Examiner's Answer.

**(12) Conclusion**

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick A. Darno/

Examiner, Art Unit 2158

09-18-2009

Conferees:

/Mohammad Ali/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2158

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166